

for money. They buy our bonds and they pay our debt. Now we are 44 percent indebted to foreign countries. And you can see how it has risen since the majority party has been emboldened by having the President in the White House. First it was 30 percent in 2000. In 2001 it was 30 percent. In 2002 it was 34 percent. In 2003, 37 percent; and 2004, 44 percent and climbing. There is no decline. There is no effort to bring a decline now.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. There is a name for that.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. What is the name?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Borrow and spend.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. That is very interesting because I heard some folks in here talking about borrowing and spending and blaming us. There is more spending that is going on, but it has not just been about the war. It has been about irresponsible policy-making here.

I want to say we want to thank those that contact us via e-mail. We receive quite a bit of e-mail from not only the American people, but also even within this Capitol complex. If you want to e-mail us at 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov, we would appreciate it.

If you want to learn more not only about Social Security but about the Democratic budget, you can go on to Democraticleader.house.gov/30something. But you can go on the Democratic leader's Web site and get what we are doing here and what we are proposing.

I think it is also important for us to talk about. One may say, why are you all talking about what the Republican budget, what they are doing to the American people?

The reason why we are talking about it is because we are not in the majority. We fought all day on this floor, 5 hours of amendments, 5 hours of debate to fight on behalf of the everyday worker and retired American in this country. And if we were in the majority, it would be totally different. Those numbers I gave on veterans, the veterans would have what they need. The true budget balancing will happen in 10 years. We have made Social Security, the issue of privatization, we can tell the President to stop spending the taxpayers' money and burning Federal jet fuel, because it is not going to happen.

So until we are able to get the majority, then we will not be able to do some of the things we are doing; but we will fight to the bitter end to make sure that we protect American people and their values.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. In the last several weeks I have tried to talk about the impact on women that the Bush administration's policies have had. For example, there are 20 million women in this country without health insurance and millions more who can barely afford to pay their premiums; but this budget does nothing to hold

down health care costs. It slashes Medicaid by a total of \$45 billion over the next 10 years. That is a devastating cut on women and children because women account for over 70 percent of adult Medicaid beneficiaries.

In terms of violence against women, the President's budget cuts the Violence Against Women Act programs by \$19 million; child care, the budget freezes funding for the Maternal and Child Health block grant and eliminates the Universal Newborn Screening Program.

Now, I have a 19-month-old. You have young children. I have passed legislation in Florida that ensured that we expanded screening for genetic anomalies and problems in newborns, and this Bush budget reverses all of that progress.

If we do not make sure we screen newborns for hearing problems, then we will have learning disabilities that are directly related to hearing abnormalities and without any excuse. But we have got to make sure that we think about children and families when prioritizing and that is what we could do. And the proof is in the pudding that we do not.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Does the gentlewoman have something else to talk about?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I also wanted to talk a little bit about health care because one of the most important issues that we have in this country is the skyrocketing cost of health care.

We have 45 million Americans who do not have health insurance. That means when they are sick, they cannot go to the doctor and they have to let their health care problems spiral out of control until they have to go to the emergency room to get the problem solved. And young Americans, our generation, are the most likely group to be insured. We think we are invincible. We think we are not going to have to worry about having health insurance and going to the doctor, so we go without. But more often we also cannot afford it.

Thirty percent of young adults age 18 to 24 have no health insurance at all. Compare that with 18 percent of adults who are 35 to 44 and only 1 percent of seniors. So the health care crisis disproportionately affects our generation, and there is nothing in the Bush budget to improve that. Where is this President's leadership on expanding access to health care?

When I go down the street, when I go to the supermarket at home, when I go to street festivals, people stop me in the street. I have heard the gentleman talk about people stopping him in the street and talking about issues that are important to them. The thing that they stop me on the most often is education and health care.

They say, if my baby girl or my baby boy is sick, I have no health insurance and I cannot get them shots. If they have a cold, I cannot bring them to the doctor. I have to wait until the prob-

lem is bad enough to bring them to the emergency room, and no mother or father should have to suffer through something like that.

This President needs to exercise some leadership in this budget on how to solve this problem and he has not. It is an abdication of leadership.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I want to close and touch a little on CDBG, which is the Community Development Block Grants.

The Republican budget cuts funding for Community Development Block Grants by \$8 billion over the next 5 years. These cuts will likely fall on Community Development Block Grants which the Republicans have proposed to eliminate, I must add eliminate. These cuts will have a significant negative impact on the ability of State and local governments to be able to provide housing and community development needs.

Last year, 1.6 billion of CDBG dollars were used for housing, and the result of that was 120,000 homeowners received assistance for rehabbing or working on their homes; and 11,000 families became first-time home buyers, and 19,000 rental units were being rehabbed.

The proposed CDBG cuts will have a particularly severe impact on the resources provided by housing and job training, domestic violence prevention, child care assistance, homeless assistance, small business development, and other services.

The Democratic budget provides \$2 billion more than the Republican budget for 2006 and \$9 billion for over the next 5 years. Community and regional development will be eliminated and the downward spiral of these block grants will be detrimental to so many communities.

I want to say to the city and county mayors, you need to call your Congressman and your Congresswoman and the Members of the other body and the administration and say the cutting of what we need will hurt our communities.

□ 2330

SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentlewoman from Kentucky (Mrs. NORTHUP) is recognized for the remaining time until midnight as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. NORTHUP. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to highlight an important

issue that has been the topic of much discussion across the country, Social Security. The Republicans in Congress have joined together to form teams to highlight important issues facing our Nation today, and I am proud to serve as the chairman of the Retirement Security team and to be joined by a number of my colleagues to discuss this important topic tonight.

First, I would like to invite the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), my colleague, to share with us some of her perspectives on Social Security and how we address those challenges.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Kentucky for yielding and allowing me to participate in this debate.

Madam Speaker, as we begin tonight, I tell my colleagues I just have to comment, listening to my colleagues from across the aisle, one would think if they were listening to this great debate that we are having here that they believe everything depends on the government; the panacea has to be the government; the solution to the problems, it has all got to be the government.

As we talk about Social Security, we want to welcome them and invite them to come participate in the debate, but I find it so interesting. They do not bring new ideas to this debate, and they keep saying let us let the government tend to it, but they do not want to talk about the importance of developing an ownership society. They do not want to talk about giving power to the people.

I always wonder when I hear someone say government is the solution, government has got the solution, leave it to government, let them work it out, let us grow a bigger government. I think about Ronald Reagan and how he always said it is all about the people. It is all about the people. That is where the solutions lie.

Whatever the debate is, whatever our colleagues across the aisle, whatever their view is on Social Security reform, I would hope that no one will oppose a discussion on this issue.

We are brought here to Washington, those of us that are elected, and we come to Congress to participate in big issues that are going to impact individuals' lives and the American people's lives. It is true that our country has a range of problems that we are facing right now, but I think it is fair to say and I think that my colleague would agree with me that strengthening and stabilizing Social Security is at the top of that list.

I would invite our colleagues from across the aisle to join us in this debate, bring some ideas and to participate in how we should look at Social Security for future generations. I think it is very unfortunate that so many across the aisle are following the lead of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the minority leader, and nearly every Democrat in the House

has chosen to stifle debate, rather than to engage in it, and I think that is not leadership. It is really obstructionism.

Madam Speaker, about a week ago, President Bush visited Memphis, Tennessee, which is just outside of my district, and I would have liked to have been there and been a part of that, but things did not quite work out that way for me on last Friday. That did not stop the Democratic National Committee from attacking both the President and me in a statewide radio ad.

Their ad was misleading at best, and it essentially said that we should not even debate reform. They are essentially saying that we should bury our head in the sand and ignore the problem until it just goes on and runs over us. I can tell my colleagues, the DNC attack ad generated two calls. Only two calls to my Shelby County, Memphis, area office in opposition to any type reform. They spent all their money, 70 stations, State-wide, and we got two negative calls. Fifty calls from people who said I think we can talk about Social Security reform but let us not squash the discussion.

In fact, I have an e-mail from a man in Collierville, which is in Shelby County near Memphis, and he says: I was listening to WREC radio today and heard a rather obnoxious DNC commercial telling me to contact you to vote against the President's effort to modify Social Security. I am contacting you but rather to encourage you to work with the President to pass a reform.

On the day of the President's visit, a front page article in the local news section of the Nashville Tennessean read, Bush trip puts Democrats' focus on Blackburn. President in Memphis for next stop in Social Security debate. All this because we want to have a discussion. We want to talk about a very real problem and what we are going to do about it.

Now, is it not amazing, here in America, here in the United States House of Representatives, here in Congress, when you want to lead on a discussion and bring to the attention of the American people something that is a problem, then it makes you a political target. That is absolutely incredible. Facing a problem, addressing and defining a problem and then working to find a solution, that is what is called leadership.

Since last fall, I have been holding town hall meetings and discussions across my district, and we have been talking about Social Security reform in these. We are letting constituents know the process that we are going through and how we are searching for the right thing, the right steps to take, and I will not sugarcoat things here. Some people are absolutely opposed to the discussion. They will not consider the idea of reform, any kind of reform, but that is not the norm. I found that most people are not only willing to discuss reform, but they have their own ideas of what we should do, and that tells me something. People are thinking about this issue.

The Democrats in the House are unwilling, really unwilling to discuss the topic. They refuse to come to the table and say, okay, let us see what we can do to fix this problem. They are out of touch with mainstream America. They were out of touch in the last election cycle, and they remain out of touch today.

I have brought with me today, Madam Speaker, a handful of the thousands of e-mails that I have received to share with you.

Here is one from a gentleman in Arlington, Tennessee. It is also in Shelby County, down near Memphis, and he says: While I agree privatization accounts should not be the number one focus, they are a significant factor in this issues reform. Please accept the correspondence as a vote in favor of President Bush's proposal. He goes on and details some of the things that he likes and does not like about what he is hearing.

On the other side, I have got one from a woman in Nashville, Tennessee: I am opposed to the privatization of Social Security. I am in favor of reform, but there are many people who could pay more into Social Security or maybe take less out.

Another man from Collierville, Tennessee: Can you help pass Social Security reform? I would appreciate the opportunity to invest a percentage of my Social Security payments.

Does that not sound like a pretty good debate. These people are not afraid to discuss it. America is discussing the issue. We would like to think that the Democrats would also.

We have several bills in the House and the Senate that are proposing different reforms, and I want Tennesseans to know that I am going to continue to review these ideas, to talk with them about the bills that are being brought forward, and we will continue to support committee action on a range of proposals.

Some of the e-mails that I have received ask why we are doing this now, why we cannot just put it off for another decade. It is similar to refinancing your house. You refinance your home mortgage today and get a much lower interest rate than you could probably 10 years from now. Why would you wait when conditions will never be better than they are now? Well, that is where with what we have to do with Social Security. Conditions for reform will not get any better than they are now. It makes no sense to wait.

□ 2340

Last week I wrote an op-ed that ran in the Memphis Commercial Appeal newspaper where I talked about four indisputable facts regarding Social Security that we should all be able to agree on regardless of our party affiliation or ideology. Those facts are these: in 1950, there were 16 workers paying into Social Security for every one retiree. Today there are only 3.3

workers for every retiree, and by the time my two children who are in their mid-twenties retire, there will only be two workers for every retiree. We have 13 years when the Social Security will begin taking in less money than it pays out to retirees.

It is time for us to move forward. We know that the American people are engaged in this debate. We know that they are participating in this debate. I have had a survey on my Web site running for a week now, and I have had a tremendous response to this. I will tell my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, they had better start taking part in this very real, very lively discussion because there is a widespread view that we should do something and do it now. The only people willing to work on this are the Republicans and the Republican leadership in Congress.

It is a disservice to our Nation that our colleagues across the aisle do not want to participate. It is not why we were sent here to Congress.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) who has been such a leader in our conference and is so eager to participate in this conversation.

There is a lot of misinformation about Social Security that is being promulgated across this country, but I think the most important facts that we can share with our constituents is that of every program and every idea that has been put forward, nobody wants to change anything for today's seniors, and there is a good reason for that.

For today's seniors, there are enough workers in the system that their Social Security check is protected. They are going to be fine. For those people that are about to retire, there are enough workers and enough money in the system to protect them. But for younger workers who are going to bear the responsibility for those who retire before them, there will not be enough workers to provide for their Social Security check. So what we want is to allow younger workers to begin to build their own nest egg so they can prepare for their own retirement as they shoulder the responsibility for those that retire before them.

Madam Speaker, I welcome the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CHOCOLA) and thank the gentleman for being part of this discussion tonight. I know the gentleman is involved in talking about Social Security in his community. Please discuss some of what you hear and some of the misconceptions.

Mr. CHOCOLA. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership on this issue. She is a tremendous leader and a clear voice in the House on this issue.

The President has recently been in my district, and I thank the President for his leadership on this issue as well, and for him taking on one of the most important issues we face as a Nation today and critical to future generations of Americans.

The President understands that we solve problems through leadership and leaders do not pass along problems to future Presidents or future generations. It was an extraordinary event when the President was in South Bend, Indiana, at Notre Dame, which I know is an institution very dear to the gentlewoman's heart, and the numbers who engaged in the dialogue on this issue were astounding.

There were over 8,000 people at the Joyce Center at Notre Dame. They came to listen to the President talk about this issue. And there were 200 people outside of the Joyce Center that were protesting the President. I would say that is a pretty good ratio. That reflects the common sense of the American people. They understand we have a problem.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Madam Speaker, that is very reflective of the numbers in my district. There were about 2,000 inside listening to the President. There were a number of organizations that tried to stir up a lot of activity outside to protest. There were about 100 people outside protesting.

That morning AARP had held their own roundtable, their own town hall meeting in order to share why they thought the President was wrong on this issue. They of course have massive organization, a huge mailing list, and they actually got 40 people to their town hall meeting. So I think people know that the organizations that are saying there is no problem and we should not be doing anything about it, whether it is to seniors as in seniors that are retired or seniors as in seniors in college that might be found on the Notre Dame campus, both of those groups are eager to talk about it and be part of the discussion.

Mr. CHOCOLA. Madam Speaker, that is absolutely true. I think one of the reasons that the President got re-elected and I think one of the reasons the gentlewoman has been reelected in a very competitive district is people appreciate leadership. It is easy to be against things, but we are elected as public servants to be for solutions; and the harder the issue, the more responsibility we have to step up to the plate and solve the problems that we face as a Nation.

What I heard the President say when he was in South Bend is we have a problem. We can call it a crisis, whatever we want; but it is clearly and undeniable challenge, and I think the American people understand that.

I heard the President say it is not the seniors' problem. If you are retired or near retirement, your benefits are safe and secure and you are going to get everything you have earned, and all options are on the table. This is a debate that should be engaged in by all. The President said it does not matter if it is a Republican idea, a Democrat idea, any good idea will be embraced and be part of the solution.

I think it is important that we focus on the facts. Recently, I sat in a hear-

ing of the Committee on Ways and Means where David Walker who is the Comptroller General of the United States, a former trustee of Social Security, and he made a pretty profound statement that we need to focus on nonpartisan facts and a bipartisan solution. I think it is important that we all engage in this debate to find a solution that benefits every single generation.

He talked about the Social Security trust fund. In his words, the trust fund has no economic value. He called it an accounting device. One of the earliest lessons I learned in business was that balance sheets and income statements are fiction, and cash flow is reality. That is a challenge that we face is in the short term we have a cash flow problem. In the medium and long term, we have a solvency problem, and that is what we are talking about and that is what we have to solve.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Madam Speaker, sometimes I use the analogy of the American family. Adults in that family come home from work, and from every single paycheck if they put \$100 in a cookie jar for their children's college education, and then they borrow to buy a car, buy clothes, go on vacation, whatever they used it for, when the child is 18, they would have a cookie jar full of IOUs. And there is still the bill for the college tuition and no money in the cookie jar. That is essentially what has happened.

Social Security was a pay-as-you-go system. Whatever came in, whether it was taken out as part of your payroll tax or part of your income tax or part of your FICA, it went into the general treasury. Those dollars paid old age benefits and paid for services that the government provided.

So none of the dollars have been saved. Maybe many of us wish, especially those of us about to retire, wish this was not a tough or impending crisis, wish back when it was established in 1945 and subsequently that they had truly put the money aside in a trust fund and it had been earning interest. But that was not done back then and it has not been done, and so we need to wrestle with the facts.

We have some good ideas. We have some ideas that will make this a good system that will be there for our children. We know it will be there for our moms and dads. My mom is 82. Obviously, I want to make sure that everything is fine for her. And I want to make sure that for those about to retire, the trust they have had in the system that they be reassured that their benefits are secure.

□ 2350

But when we talk about it as a crisis, I will use another analogy and say it is like jumping off an 80-story building. As you pass the 40th floor, you can say, well, nothing bad has happened yet, but clearly intervention is needed. And intervention is needed today in Social Security.

Mr. CHOCOLA. I do think facts are very important in this debate. We need to focus on the facts because the facts are what is going to lead us to a solution. Unfortunately, our friends on the other side of the aisle really do not offer any solutions. They just criticize principles that the President has offered and others have offered. They call some of these principles a risky scheme. They say that we are putting Social Security at risk. But the reality is the riskiest thing we can do is nothing. The riskiest thing we can do is ignore this problem and pass it on to future generations and really suffer, I think, very negative consequences.

These are certain things we know. We know that the system cannot pay the benefits that are promised. If we do nothing, we know that there will be a benefit cut to future retirees of about 27 percent. We know that we have a \$10.4 trillion unfunded liability. That is in present dollars. That is, if we had \$10.4 trillion, and that is with a T, in the bank today earning interest that we could fund the unfunded liabilities. If we had to pay every year, it is something like \$27 trillion that we have in unfunded liability. Just to put that in perspective, the current national debt is just over \$7 trillion. So the unfunded liability that we know that we have to face in the future is four times the size of the national debt today. People say, well, if we would find a solution that would require us to make transition financing or transition costs, that might be \$1 trillion or \$2 trillion. The reality is that is not additional debt. If the Federal Government accounted like every business in America, and I will not get in the weeds here and talk about accrual accounting, but if the Federal Government recognized its unfunded liabilities like every business does, we would already have that on the books. It would already be part of our national debt. So finding a way to move some of these costs up is not additional debt, it simply, as the gentlewoman from Tennessee said, is prepaying our mortgage. It is finding a way to spend money now to reduce our real costs in the future and preserve the system, make it stronger and make sure it is here for every generation.

It has been one of the greatest programs in our Nation's history. It has served our seniors well. We need to make sure that the system is there to continue to serve future generations just as well as it is serving our seniors today.

Mrs. NORTHUP. It is amazing that people talk about this being a risky solution when, in fact, the riskiest thing we could do is to do nothing. The fact is that as we wait, each year it grows worse. In fact, right now because Social Security is bringing in a surplus, we still have a few years left where we could use those dollars to help fund a transition. For every year we wait, we lose one of these years that we are in surplus and we pick up at the other end of the 75-year spectrum that we are

looking at, a year where we have \$600 billion of additional unfunded liability. So we not only give a year of transition up, we gain a year where we have huge, impossible-to-meet deficits and unfunded liabilities.

I came to the House 8 years ago. There has not ever been a leader in the White House and certainly resolving this problem is going to take all the leadership potential that we have in this country and we need the White House. There has never been a leader in the White House that was willing to roll up their sleeves and to say, Let's work our way through this, let's bring everybody to the table, let's put all the ideas on the table and certainly a solution is going to take multiple ideas and maybe more than just one idea, personalized accounts or whatever. But if we had done this right when I first came to Congress back in 1996, before I understood how serious and how quickly the situation was deteriorating for future generations, I think if we had addressed the problem then, we would have gotten 8 more years of surpluses and certainly those surpluses before we had the war on terror, before we had some of the other challenges, and we would not be where we are today if we had addressed those. And so to wait even one more year is going to make the situation more costly, more difficult, we are going to lose a year of surplus that could help finance this transition. That looks like a crisis to me.

Mr. CHOCOLA. I think it is certainly a crisis depending on your time frame and certainly our seniors today are fine, those about to retire are fine, but those retiring in the future will face this crisis if we do not act now. Those that say that there is no problem, that there is no need to act until the year 2042 when the trust fund is exhausted really need to answer the question, how are they going to pay the benefits? If they would come to the floor or they would offer their solution by saying, well, if we raise payroll taxes by 50 percent, maybe we could address this crisis and they may be right. But the reality is that more Americans pay payroll taxes than they do income taxes. When you want less of something, increase taxes on it. When you increase taxes on jobs, it would be devastating to our economy, it would be devastating to many low- and middle-income families.

I think it is critical that we find a package of good ideas, and personal accounts may be one of those good ideas, but the people that want to raise taxes have to, I think, face up to the devastating effects that they would have on our economy and our families and they also have to face up to the fact that we have already raised taxes since Social Security was put into place 22 times. Each one of those times it did not solve the problem. If you add in when we raised the cap on earnings, which is currently \$90,000, the total goes up to 39 times. And so it is critical

that we find this package of good ideas that not only solves the problem today but permanently solves the problem so future Members of this body do not have to come down and engage in this debate and say why we failed to act and did not live up to our responsibility as elected officials.

Mrs. NORTHUP. We know that we could not possibly tax our way out of these problems, we could not raise taxes enough and have a viable economy left if we tried to solve the Social Security problem with tax increases. We can look across the ocean to economies, for example, France where they did not address the Social Security problem, the Social Security challenge that they have there and because now the cost of those senior survivor benefits are so high in France, their economy is crumbling under the weight of those costs. In fact, no matter what solution we have, we depend on growth in this economy to fund the transition. And so we have to have two things. We have to have a plan to save and strengthen Social Security for our children. It is safe for today's seniors but for our children, to make it safe and secure and solvent for them, and we need a growing economy so that they can have those good jobs, so that they can build the personal accounts while they meet the Social Security needs for those that were in the workforce before them. And so growth and a new plan to enhance the Social Security for future generations are both needed. We cannot trade a growing economy in order to strengthen Social Security, because raising taxes would have a chilling effect on our economy and at the same time it would only be a very short-term fix.

I think these conversations, conversations with the American people, conversations with our constituents when we go back home and conversations between each other are helping us grow to better understand, better analyze the problem and to put forth good ideas. I am excited about the ideas that are being put forth. They are not scary to me. They are exciting.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana to share with us his closing thoughts.

Mr. CHOCOLA. Again I would like to thank the gentlewoman for her courageous leadership on this, willing to take the risk of leadership to solve important problems for our Nation. I, too, hear when I am at home doing town hall meetings, why do we not put the money aside, why do we not spend it on general fund items like Congress has been doing for 60 years now. There is a mechanism to make sure that the money can only be used for Social Security benefits. That mechanism is called personal accounts. When you allow people to set aside part of their payroll taxes into a personal account, that they have some discretion on how that money is invested in a very safe and secure investment. That money is theirs. It cannot be used for any other

purpose and it is going back to a term that has been used in the past, a personal lockbox for every individual.

Again, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership. This is a debate that will be ongoing and one that is critical to the future of our Nation.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHIEF OF STAFF OF THE HONORABLE PETE SESSIONS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE) laid before the House the following communication from Charles Bauer, Chief of Staff of the Honorable PETE SESSIONS, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
March 8, 2005.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the 3rd Judicial District Court of Henderson County, Texas, for testimony.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is inconsistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

CHARLES BAUER,
Chief of Staff.

COMMUNICATION FROM OUTREACH COORDINATOR OF THE HONORABLE PETE SESSIONS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Flo Helton, Outreach Coordinator of the Honorable PETE SESSIONS, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
March 8, 2005.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules

of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the 3rd Judicial District Court of Henderson County, Texas, for testimony.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is inconsistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

FLO HELTON,
Outreach Coordinator.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE PETE SESSIONS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable PETE SESSIONS, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
March 15, 2005.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the 3rd Judicial District Court of Henderson County, Texas, for testimony.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is inconsistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

PETE SESSIONS,
Member of Congress.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McDERMOTT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RUSH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. McDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today and March 17 and 18.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1160. An act to reauthorize the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant program through June 30, 2005, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 384. An act to extend the existence of the Nazi War Crimes and Japanese Imperial Government Records Interagency Working Group for two years.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at midnight), the House adjourned until today, Thursday, March 17, 2005, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for speaker-authorized official travel during the fourth quarter of 2004 and the first quarter of 2005, pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MS. VANESSA GRIDDINE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN NOV. 9 AND NOV. 16, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Vanessa Griddine	11/9	11/11	Austria	236.07	305.00	305.00
	11/11	11/14	Italy	1,548.00	2,000.00	2,000.00
	11/14	11/16	Russia	20,850	728.00	728.00
Committee total	3,033.00		3,033.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.